

THE *Dan Smoot Report*

Vol. 9, No. 13

(Broadcast 398)

April 1, 1963

Dallas, Texas



DAN SMOOT

UNITED NATIONS

UNSF

In 1953, the United Nations General Assembly voted to create a Special United Nations Fund for Economic Development (SUNFED); but the proposal lagged, without much action or publicity, until 1956 and 1957, when the American public learned that SUNFED supporters were urging a program that would cost 5 billion dollars a year, with the United States paying 70% of the total. Hans W. Singer, a Briton, who made the prospectus for SUNFED said:

"It will be a heavy burden on American taxpayers, but you will just have to manage that. You'll get accustomed to paying the taxes."⁽¹⁾

Public and congressional reaction in the United States forced the State Department to oppose the SUNFED scheme. Paul G. Hoffman was a member of the U.S. delegation which, as Mr. Hoffman says, "had the burden of discouraging the creation of SUNFED."⁽²⁾

But Mr. Hoffman (a member of the Council on Foreign Relations, who, in the past, was instrumental in creating some of the most effective affiliates of the Council, such as the Committee for Economic Development) took the initiative (on behalf of the United States government) in proposing a substitute for SUNFED. The substitute was called United Nations Special Fund (UNSF).

Whereas SUNFED would have made loans, UNSF makes outright gifts. Mr. Hoffman says:

"SUNFED . . . [would have been] a capital lending organization. The Special Fund . . . is an entirely different kind of organization. Instead of making loans, it makes grants to low-income countries to undertake projects aimed at making development investment in those countries either feasible or more effective."⁽²⁾

THE DAN SMOOT REPORT, a magazine published every week by The Dan Smoot Report, Inc., mailing address P. O. Box 9538, Lakewood Station, Dallas 14, Texas, Telephone TAYlor 1-2303 (Office Address 6441 Gaston Avenue). Subscription rates: \$10.00 a year, \$6.00 for 6 months, \$18.00 for two years. For first class mail \$12.50 a year; by airmail (including APO and FPO) \$14.50 a year. Reprints of specific issues: 1 copy for 25¢; 6 for \$1.00; 50 for \$5.50; 100 for \$10.00 — each price for bulk mailing to one person. Add 2% sales tax on all orders originating in Texas for Texas delivery.

Copyright by Dan Smoot, 1963. Second class mail privilege authorized at Dallas, Texas.

No reproductions permitted.

The General Assembly of the United Nations approved Paul Hoffman's idea. UNSF — United Nations Special Fund — was created, and began operations on January 1, 1959. Paul G. Hoffman is Managing Director. The governing body of UNSF is called "Governing Council of the Special Fund." It is composed of representatives from 18 nations — 9 from "economically less developed" nations; 9 from "more industrial nations."⁽³⁾

The Special Fund is financed by "voluntary" contributions from member nations of the United Nations. The United States annually contributes 40% of the grand total. Governments in the receiving countries must raise a portion of the total cost of the projects.

During the first four years of operations (January, 1959 to January, 1963), the Special Fund approved 286 projects in 74 countries and territories. The total estimated cost of all 286 projects was 588 million, 784 thousand, 716 dollars (\$588,784,716.00). Of that total amount, the nations receiving the aid had pledged to spend 338 million, 158 thousand, 916 dollars (\$338,158,916.00) to help themselves. The UN Special Fund had pledged the remainder, 250 million, 625 thousand, 800 dollars (\$250,625,800.00) of which, the United States pledged 100 million, 400 thousand dollars (\$100,400,000.00).

Practically all nations which have pledged contributions to the UN Special Fund, and practically all receiving nations which have pledged to match the UN Fund grants, have received more than enough direct aid from the United States to meet their pledges.

Thus, if we consider our direct contributions to the Special Fund, and our aid to practically all other nations giving to, and receiving from, the Fund, we find that we are financing the Special Fund almost 100%.

During the four-year period when the United States made, to the United Nations Special Fund, direct contributions totaling 100 million, 400 thousand dollars, *all* commu-

nist countries (including, of course, the Soviet Union) pledged a total of 8 million, 228 thousand, 225 dollars (\$8,228,225.00).

During that four-year period, communist nations *received* from the United Nations Special Fund contributions totaling \$10,846,500.00 (10 million, 846 thousand, 500 dollars).⁽⁴⁾

In Yugoslavia, one project being financed by the UN Special Fund is for a nuclear research and training center (supposedly restricted to research concerning agricultural matters).⁽⁵⁾

Among the 74 nations receiving aid from the UN Special Fund there are, in addition to communist countries, many which cannot yet be characterized as communist nations but which are in the grip of communists, or pro-communists, or socialists who detest the American constitutional system. For example, Burma has received \$4,193,000.00; Brazil, \$4,965,200.00; India, \$17,391,500.00; Indonesia, \$1,548,300.00; Laos, \$583,900.00; Venezuela, \$4,780,300.00.

Israel, which is providing training for the armed forces of the communist dictator of Ghana, has received \$2,643,200.00 from the UN Special Fund.⁽⁶⁾

In short, the United Nations Special Fund is another means by which American taxpayers are being forced to subsidize socialist and communist dictators all over the world.

The situation was not brought to public attention in the United States, however, until the early part of 1963, when the press reported that the Special Fund had approved an aid grant to Cuba.

In May, 1961, Paul Hoffman and the Governing Council of the United Nations Special Fund approved a grant to finance expansion of the Central Agricultural Experimental Station in Santiago de las Vegas, Cuba. The total cost of the project was estimated at 3 million dollars — 1 million, 157 thousand, 600 dollars to be given by the Special Fund, the remainder

to be raised by Castro's government. The United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) was chosen as the "administering" agency.

I reported on this UN grant to Castro in the May 15, 1961, issue of this *Report* and in my book *The Invisible Government*, which was published in June, 1962 — although, in both, I inaccurately called the UN Special Fund *SUNFED*.

It was late in 1962 (after our "blockade" of Cuba) before Castro would let representatives of the UN "administering" agency (FAO) enter Cuba to sign agreements that were necessary before the aid could be given.

In January, 1963, United States representatives in the United Nations formally objected to the Special Fund grant to Cuba, pointing out that 40% of it would come from United States taxpayers.⁽⁷⁾

On February 13, 1963, Paul G. Hoffman announced that the United Nations Special Fund was going ahead with the gift to Castro, despite vigorous objections from the United States. Saying he had been under pressure not to make the grant to Castro, Hoffman said he would resign before yielding to such pressure.

Hoffman promised, however, that the UN Special Fund would spend no American money on the Cuban project!⁽⁸⁾ He did not explain how this miracle would be accomplished, since 40% of every dollar the Fund spends, anywhere for any purpose, is contributed directly by the United States.

The United Nations Special Fund is by no means the only UN organization giving our tax money to communist countries. During the 1961-62 fiscal year, the United Nations Expanded Program of Technical Assistance gave Cuba \$445,883 for 10 projects. The United States pays for 40% of this UN outfit's expenditures.⁽⁹⁾

In November, 1962, the UN Technical Assistance Committee of the Economic and Social Council approved 11 projects for Cuba for the 1963-64 fiscal year. Nine of these 11 projects will cost \$1,033,080.00. Cost of the

other 2 projects has not yet been estimated.⁽¹⁰⁾

The UN initiated the Volta River project in communist Ghana. The United States has promised to pay 52% of the total cost. This project alone will take more than 360 million American tax dollars.⁽¹¹⁾

United Nations Fish Story

Congress and the American press generally ignored the UN Special Fund grant to Castro in 1961, when the grant was first approved; but in 1963, Cuba was a sore subject. The thought that money, taken away from American taxpayers, was being given to Castro, rankled.

Urged on by outraged constituents, many United States Representatives and Senators began to question the wisdom of our membership in United Nations Organizations which can use our tax money to subsidize our sworn enemies, in open defiance of our protests.

During February and March, 1963, United States Representative Durward G. Hall (Republican, Missouri) made a searching investigation into the costs and operations of the United Nations Special Fund. In one speech to the House, Mr. Hall pointed out that, although the United States pays most of the Fund's bills, the United States is one country which never receives a penny from the outfit. Thereupon, various United Nations officials assured Mr. Hall that the United States *has* received aid from the United Nations. Mr. Hall asked for details. He was told that the UN had sent a Chinese expert to teach American rice farmers how to grow fish in rice paddies.

The sum of the Chinese expert's advice to American farmers, as best Mr. Hall could determine, is the following:

"In their wild state, they (the fish in the rice paddies) only spawn when they are happy. Our problem is how to make them happy in captivity. We might have to feed them special vitamins, make sure they get their calories and even give them hormone injections to make them more peppy."

Mr. Hall could not, however, find out where, or when, this UN Special Fund aid project to the United States was conducted. The UN Information Center in Washington told him the rice-fish project was in Kansas — which has no rice paddies. The New York Office of the UN Food and Agriculture Organization told him the project was in Arkansas. Mr. Hall found in a book written by Paul G. Hoffman a statement that the rice-fish project was in Louisiana. Mr. Hall wrote Hoffman to find out *where* in Louisiana, and to get other details. In reply, Mr. Hoffman merely admitted that he had made a “regrettable mistake” in his book. But he did not tell Mr. Hall what the mistake was, or where the rice-fish project was.

From remarks by officials of the American government and from odds and ends of information supplied by various UN officials, Mr. Hall concluded that some Chinese expert had come to the United States to tell our rice farmers to keep their fish happy and that the United States Government had paid for the expert’s services directly; but Mr. Hall never determined when the Chinaman came, where he went, whom he advised, or how much we paid him.⁽¹²⁾

UNESCO’s Soviet Propaganda

On February 14, 1963, American newspapers which carried stories about the UN Special Fund’s gift of American tax money to Castro, also carried stories about a booklet published by UNESCO (United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization) almost a year before.

The 106-page booklet is entitled *Equality of Rights Between Races and Nationalities in the USSR*. It was written by two Soviet nationals (I. P. Tsamarian and S. L. Ronin). It was published by UNESCO in March, 1962. The book is pure Soviet propaganda, denouncing “race discrimination” in the United States and “colonialist oppression” in the western world generally, while praising Soviet “race

relations” as one of the major social triumphs of the twentieth century. It speaks of the “immense progress . . . in all economic and cultural fields” in communist China, since China “freed itself from colonial domination, overthrew the reactionary regime, and established the rule of the people.”

Here are a few other quotations from the UNESCO booklet:

“Only the revolution of October 1917, which . . . instituted the Soviet system, enabled the peoples of Russia to achieve genuine equality of rights and freedom of development. . . . It was the Communist Party which showed the peoples of Russia the true way to free themselves from social and national oppression. . . .

“The Soviet Union is a brotherhood of free and equal peoples, comprising 15 sovereign Soviet Republics in voluntary association on a footing of complete equality. Under the Constitution of the U.S.S.R., each of these Republics retains the right to secede from the union. Each of them embodies the collective will of its people and can decide its own future in entire freedom.”⁽¹³⁾

The United States paid 32.02% of the total cost of publishing this UNESCO pamphlet and giving it world-wide distribution — a great deal more than the Soviet Union paid.

The fact that American taxpayers are paying for United Nations publications to distribute such infamous lies in support of world communism — coming to public attention simultaneously with facts about the United Nations giving our tax money to Cuba — aroused considerable ire. Members of Congress and representatives of the press demanded a statement from our State Department. An official of the State Department said that, on April 25, 1962, the Department had “protested vigorously” (with vigghah?).⁽¹⁴⁾

UN Lies About the Congo

On March 21, 1963, United Nations officials in the Congo admitted that the United Nations had been lying about its operations in

the Congo.

While decent people all over the earth were appalled at the United Nations war to subject the province of Katanga to the rule of the communist-controlled Congolese government, not very many were aware that other provinces of the former Belgian Congo were also trying to exercise self-determination, in order to escape domination by the central government. One such province was South Kasai.

Congolese and United Nations armies used the same savage tactics to suppress South Kasai that they used in Katanga. Mission stations and hospitals were ransacked and pillaged. Eyewitnesses told of United Nations-supported Congolese troops pouring gasoline on huts, setting them afire, and shooting down all who tried to escape. Whole villages and towns were destroyed. More than 100,000 South Kasaians, who escaped the guns and bayonets of United Nations and Congolese troops, fled into the brush, to suffer famine.⁽¹⁵⁾

Thus, United States tax money was used by the United Nations to suppress rebellion in the province of South Kasai in the Congo.

For two months, while this frightful operation was afoot, United Nations officials denied that any unusual action was taking place in South Kasai. Then, on March 21, 1963, United Press International dispatched a news story from Leopoldville, with the following opening paragraph:

"The United Nations, after constantly denying it for two months, finally admitted Thursday it had crushed an active rebellion against the Congolese government in South Kasai province."⁽¹⁵⁾

Dangers of Our UN Membership

The "bad" publicity which the United Nations received in America during the months of February and March, 1963, provided no new information for Americans who have studied UN operations from the beginning. These Americans who know and care have realized since 1945 that American mem-

bership in the United Nations would not only bring disgrace upon our nation but would eventually lead to the destruction of our free and independent Republic.

Our membership in the United Nations became official on July 28, 1945, when the United States Senate ratified the United Nations Charter. Only two Senators voted against ratification: William Langer of North Dakota, and Henrik Shipstead of Minnesota. Senator Hiram Johnson of California was on his death bed and could not *vote* against ratification, but he went on record against it.

Langer is now dead; but the American people should read again the words that he spoke on July 28, 1945, when he voted against ratification of the United Nations Charter. Senator Langer said:

"Practically all members of this body have indicated that they will vote for the charter. Under my oath . . . and under my conscience, I cannot so vote. If I did I would feel that I was betraying the hundreds of thousands who have died in this war for the United States, and the hundreds of thousands who have sacrificed their loved ones and their treasure. . . . I feel from the bottom of my heart that the adoption of the charter — and, make sure, we are going to implement it — will mean perpetuating war. I feel that it will mean the enslavement of millions of people from Poland to India, from Korea to Java, as well as people in many other places on this earth.

"Mr. President, I feel that the adoption of the charter will be one step more toward compulsory and military conscription, and all that which goes with war.

"In my opinion, the charter is not at all similar to the Constitution of the United States which was adopted by the Original Colonies. . . .

"I believe it is fraught with danger to the American people, and to American institutions. . . .

"I cannot, I will not, God helping me, vote for a measure which I believe to be unlawful under our Constitution, a measure which, in my opinion, betrays the very people who sent us to the Senate as their representatives."⁽¹⁶⁾

Senator Langer spoke broadly about the dangers of our membership in the United

Nations. One specific danger is that the United Nations provides the cover of diplomatic immunity for communist spies, saboteurs, and secret police agents sent into the United States.

Communist agents, attached to UN delegations from communist countries, enter and leave the United States at will. They serve as couriers for the communist world-wide espionage network. They bring in tons of propaganda material. They direct espionage and sabotage activities in the United States.

The case of 21 Russian seamen in 1956 proved that the Soviet secret police, under cover of UN diplomatic representation, actually operate inside the United States, terrorizing refugees who have sought asylum here, contemptuously defying American laws and American law-enforcement agencies.

A group of Russian seamen who had been given asylum in America were working and living in New York and New Jersey. Soviet secret police, with UN credentials, went into their homes, beat them into submission, kidnapped them, and forced them to return to Russia. American law enforcement agencies knew what was happening. In fact, they stood by and watched but did nothing, because the Soviet secret police *would not permit* them to do anything — in New York City, mind you.⁽¹⁷⁾

UN Peace Record

Since the UN was established to “save succeeding generations from the scourge of war,” and to guarantee self-determination for all people, one of the bloodiest wars in history has been fought.

Communists have conquered China, Tibet, Laos, Cuba, Ghana, British Guiana, and a whole tier of Eastern European states from the Baltic to the Adriatic — not to mention Indonesia and a score of new African nations controlled by communist sympathizers — and have murdered millions of people in the process.

The United Nations has not even protested against these communist conquests.

UN idolators still talk about the Korean war as a UN police action which stopped the spread of communism. Actually, the UN police action in Korea did more for the spread of communism than anything else has ever done.

American and South Korean soldiers did virtually all the fighting, and the United States bore practically 100% of the cost. The UN acted merely to hamstring American operations so that our soldiers sent into battle to die, could not use their best weapons to destroy the enemy. The Korean war was the worst disaster in American history: it cost us the lives of over 50,000 American soldiers; it built Red China into a menacing military power; it lost us the respect of all of Asia; and it ended, on enemy terms, as the first war America ever lost — primarily because of the United Nations.

UN “Ideal”

In some quarters, it does no good to recite the UN’s failures. UN supporters will say, “Well, you can’t expect perfection. The UN means well, and we must keep trying.”

As long as we keep trying to do anything in the United Nations, we are headed for ruin — because the UN is an international socialist conspiracy whose aim is to produce a socialist one-world. The best way to prove this is to examine the United Nations “Bill of Rights.”

On June 21, 1946, the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations established a UN Commission on Human Rights. The task of this Commission was to write the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights — to elaborate upon the ideals and objectives broadly outlined in Chapter IX of the UN Charter.

Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, America’s representative on the Commission, was the first chairman. One of Mrs. Roosevelt’s successors as chairman of the UN Human Rights Com-

mission was an internationally famous socialist, Dr. Charles Malik, of Lebanon.

Writing later of his experience in the UN Human Rights Commission, Dr. Malik candidly admitted that the activities of that Commission "responded for the most part more to Soviet than to Western promptings."

The Human Rights Commission completed the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights in 1948; and on December 10, 1948, the General Assembly of the United Nations unanimously adopted the Declaration as a statement of United Nations ideals.

These same ideals can be found in the Constitution of the Soviet Union:

Article 23 of the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights: Everyone has the right to work . . . and to equal pay for equal work. *Article 118 of the Constitution of the Soviet Union:* Citizens of the USSR have the right to work . . . and payment for their work in accordance with its quantity and quality.

Article 23 of the UN Declaration of Human Rights: Everyone has the right to form and to join trade unions. *Article 126,*

Constitution of the Soviet Union: Citizens of the USSR are insured the right to unite . . . in trade unions.

Article 24 of the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights: Everyone has the right to rest and leisure. *Article 119, Constitution of the Soviet Union:* Citizens of the USSR have the right to rest and leisure.

Article 22 of UN Declaration: Everyone . . . has the right to social security. *Article 120 of the Constitution of the USSR* has the same provision.

Article 26 of the UN Declaration of Human Rights: Everyone has the right to education. *Article 120 of the Soviet Constitution:* Citizens of the USSR have the right to education.

Article 25 of the UN Declaration of Human Rights: Motherhood and childhood are entitled to special care and assistance. All children, whether born in or out of wedlock, shall enjoy the same social protection. *Article 122 of the Soviet Constitution* has a similar provision.

The United Nations-Soviet ideal (that all-powerful government should provide rights and benefits for the people) is the exact oppo-

THE DAN SMOOT TELEVISION BROADCASTS ARE PRODUCED ON FILM. HENCE, WE HAVE 16 MM SOUND FILM RECORDINGS COVERING ALL SUBJECTS DISCUSSED IN THIS REPORT. THE FILM IS NOW AVAILABLE TO THE PUBLIC. WRITE FOR FREE FILM CATALOGUE.

DAN SMOOT,
P. O. Box 9538, Lakewood Station
Dallas 14, Texas

☐ Renewal ☐ New Subscription

Please enter my subscription for (_____ years) (_____ months) to THE DAN SMOOT REPORT. I enclose \$_____

SUBSCRIPTION RATES

(Add 2% Sales tax if ordered
in Texas for Texas delivery)

Rates: \$18 for 2 years
\$10 for 1 year
\$ 6 for six months
\$12.50, first class mail
for 1 year
\$14.50, air mail
for 1 year

PRINT NAME _____

STREET ADDRESS _____

CITY, ZONE AND STATE _____

Inquire for foreign mailing
including Canada

site of the American ideal that men get their rights from God, not from government; that government can give the people nothing it has not first taken away; that man, if he is to be free, must restrict government to a very limited and negative role.

What To Do

We cannot restore the eternal principles and ideals of government which made the United States the envy of the earth, as long as we stay in the United Nations and subscribe to its totalitarian principles.

On October 7, 1961, the *People's World* (West Coast newspaper of the communist party) published an editorial entitled "Save the UN," saying:

"The UN commands a great reservoir of support in our country. This support should now be made vocal.

"People should write President Kennedy, telling him —

"Do not withdraw from UN.

"Restore UN to the Grand Design of Franklin Roosevelt — the design for peaceful coexistence."

American withdrawal from the United Nations would be a severe blow to the worldwide communist movement, and a tremendous boost to the cause of freedom.

Surely, the events so widely publicized in February and March, 1963, will lead the American people to support the efforts of two of the best men in the United States Congress: Representatives Bruce Alger and James B. Utt, both of whom introduced Bills on January 9, 1963, to get the United States out of the United Nations (Alger Bill, HR 263; Utt Bill, HR 427).⁽¹⁸⁾

FOOTNOTES

- (1) *Chicago Daily Tribune*, October 29, 1956, p. 1-20
- (2) Letter of Paul G. Hoffman to Dan Smoot, November 26, 1962
- (3) *The Priorities of Progress: The United Nations Special Fund 1961*, published by the United Nations, New York
- (4) Statistical tables on costs and operations of the United Nations Special Fund in the *Congressional Record*, February 21, 1963, pp. 2553 ff.; February 28, 1963, pp. 3072 ff.; March 19, 1963, pp. 4324 ff.
- (5) Remarks of U. S. Representative Durward G. Hall (Republican, Missouri), *Congressional Record*, February 25, 1963, pp. 2808 ff.
- (6) "New Helpmate for New Nations," by Albert Q. Maisel, *The Rotarian*, November, 1961, pp. 160 ff.; "Israel Builds Friendship in Africa," by Robert Hewett, *Minneapolis Star*, September 1, 1960
- (7) "U.S. Fights U.N. Grant For Castro," *Dallas Times Herald*, January 9, 1963, p. 14-A
- (8) "U.S. Protest Fails To Deter U.N. Aid Project For Cubans," *The Dallas Morning News*, February 14, 1963, Section I, p. 2
- (9) Remarks of U.S. Representative Durward G. Hall, *Congressional Record*, February 21, 1963, pp. 2552 ff.
- (10) Remarks of U.S. Representative Durward G. Hall, *Congressional Record*, March 6, 1963, pp. 3357 ff.
- (11) *The Dallas Morning News*, March 9, 1963, Section I, p. 6
- (12) "A United Nations Fish Story," remarks of U.S. Representative Durward G. Hall, *Congressional Record*, March 18, 1963, pp. 4178 ff.
- (13) "Communists Use United Nations To Promote Their Cause," Extension of Remarks of U.S. Representative John M. Ashbrook (Republican, Ohio), *Congressional Record*, March 21, 1963, p. A1604
- (14) "U.N. Booklet Hails Red 'Brotherhood,'" *The Dallas Morning News*, February 14, 1963, Section I, p. 2
- (15) "U.N. Admits Halting Rebellion In Congo," *The Dallas Morning News*, March 22, 1963, Section I, p. 3
- (16) Remarks of U.S. Senator William Langer, *Congressional Record*, July 28, 1958, p. 13946
- (17) *Chicago Daily Tribune*, May 4, 1956, pp. 1, 10
- (18) *Congressional Quarterly Weekly Report*, March 22, 1963, pp. 359 ff.

WHO IS DAN SMOOT?

Dan Smoot was born in Missouri. Reared in Texas, he attended SMU in Dallas, taking BA and MA degrees from that university in 1938 and 1940.

In 1941, he joined the faculty at Harvard as a Teaching Fellow in English, doing graduate work for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the field of American Civilization.

In 1942, he took leave of absence from Harvard in order to join the FBI. At the close of the war, he stayed in the FBI, rather than return to Harvard.

He worked as an FBI Agent in all parts of the nation, handling all kinds of assignments. But for three and a half years, he worked exclusively on communist investigations in the industrial midwest. For two years following that, he was on FBI headquarters staff in Washington, as an Administrative Assistant to J. Edgar Hoover.

After nine and a half years in the FBI, Smoot resigned to help start the Facts Forum movement in Dallas. As the radio and television commentator for Facts Forum, Smoot, for almost four years spoke to a national audience giving both sides of great controversial issues.

In July, 1955, he resigned and started his own independent program, in order to give only one side — the side that uses fundamental American principles as a yardstick for measuring all important issues.

If you believe that Dan Smoot is providing effective tools for those who want to think and talk and write on the side of freedom, you can help immensely by subscribing, and encouraging others to subscribe, to *The Dan Smoot Report*.